

The Commoner.

Vol. 1. No. 13.

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 19, 1901.

\$1.00 a Year

Not Ingratitude, But Caution.

The Spanish War Journal accuses the Cubans of ingratitude and its language would indicate that it is anxious for the Cubans to give this nation an excuse for whipping them. It says:

It would be hard to find a people as ungrateful and unworthy of respect as the Cubans. They are a contemptible lot of curs. After all the Americans have done for them, the lives we gave up for them and the suffering we endured for their sake, they want to turn us out of Cuba without any rights whatever, not even a coaling station. Those of us who served in Cuba know them. I hope that when the time comes for us to "lick" them for good and all the United States will allow the Spanish War Veterans to go there in a body and finish the task. When we whipped the Spaniards in Cuba, we did the work only half, for we ought to have licked the Cubans "to boot." They should be wiped off the earth. They all want office and to live fat and do nothing.

It is hardly fair to accuse the Cubans of ingratitude, when the administration has given such unmistakable evidence of a desire to repudiate the pledge made at the beginning of the war. Men who fought many years for freedom and endured every conceivable sacrifice in their efforts to secure it, ought to be dealt with as patriots and not as renegades.

The republican party is to blame for the fact that the Cubans entertain suspicions as to our intentions. Nothing has been demanded as a matter of right that would not, in all probability, have been conceded as a matter of favor. There is no danger that the Cuban people will ever desire to surrender their independence to an European nation and if they do attempt it the Monroe doctrine can be invoked to prevent it. If the administration had so acted as to convince the Cubans that they were to have their independence without unnecessary delay they would out of gratitude have consented to our occupancy of any necessary naval stations. But if they have reasons to fear aggression from us, is it strange that they decline to give us a foothold on their island? When they see the Porto Ricans denied the representation which they had under Spain; when they see the Filipinos hunted through jungles because they want to govern themselves; and when they read the utterances of men like Senator Beveridge, and editorials like the one above quoted, is it surprising that they decline to trust the American people? It is not ingratitude, it is simply caution born of experience with an old master and observation of a (possible) new one.

Was Aguinaldo a Rebel?

A reader asks whether Aguinaldo was a rebel. That is a matter of opinion. A rebel is defined by Webster to be "one who revolts

from the government to which he owes allegiance." Did Aguinaldo owe allegiance to the United States? Those who believe that this nation could buy sovereignty over the Filipinos believe that, sovereignty having been bought, Aguinaldo owed allegiance to this country, and was, therefore, a rebel in making war against it.

Those who believe, with THE COMMONER, that sovereignty could not be bought, and that Spain could not transfer title to the Filipinos, deny that the Filipinos owed us allegiance, and, therefore, deny that Aguinaldo, and his followers stood in the attitude of rebels.

"A Legislative Lie."

The Chicago Record-Herald reproduces from the Congressional Record a dialogue which took place between Senators Hale and Spooner:

Mr. Hale—I am profoundly impressed and profoundly depressed by the fact that I find in hundreds of quarters a determination that we shall never withdraw from Cuba, but shall retain her as a possession of the United States.

Mr. Spooner—It will never turn out, my friend from Maine, that any man in any country can point to the Teller resolution and say with truth that it was a legislative lie.

Mr. Hale—I hope so.

Mr. Spooner—The senator need not hope so; he had better know so.

Mr. Hale—I do not know.

Mr. Spooner—Well, he ought to know.

It is interesting, in the light of passing events, to recall the skepticism of the senator from Maine and the confidence of the senator from Wisconsin.

The only comment that the Record-Herald adds—but it is enough—is, "And now we know that the Platt amendment has made of the resolutions of April 26th, 1898, 'a legislative lie.'"

Favored Banks.

The New York World charges that favored banks have in their coffers nearly ninety million dollars of government money, loaned to them by the treasury department without interest and loaned out by these banks at their established rates of discount.

The World shows that at the last report the favored national banks of the United States, designated as

United States depositories, had \$87,992,782 of Government money, on which they were asked to pay no interest and for which they had merely to give the favor of the Secretary of the Treasury and deposit with him government bonds to the amount of the sums deposited by him in the various banks.

These government bonds bear interest, which the owners collect. They are permitted to use the

Government money in the ordinary course of their banking business. It costs them nothing, and they can loan it out to their best advantage.

For example, there are forty-four national banks in New York City. The favored banks, with their deposits, are:

Chase	\$ 1,738,500.00
Hanover	4,975,695.00
Mercantile	575,650.00
National Bank of Commerce.....	2,757,867.10
National Bank of North America....	717,075.00
National Bank of the Republic.....	784,000.00
National City (Standard Oil) Bank..	14,490,500.00
Western National.....	1,650,653.06

Watterson on Destiny.

In a recent issue of the Courier-Journal Mr. Watterson, that quaint and always interesting journalist, advises his party to raise the white flag and surrender to the republican party on the question of imperialism. He does not announce that he is convinced of the righteousness of the republican position, but he excuses himself by assuming that it is impossible to combat the forces which seem to be behind the republican party. He admits that imperialism is an innovation upon American principles and antagonistic to the teachings of the earlier statesmen. Here are his words:

Let us say at once that the scheme of occupying a territory remote from our borders, of subduing a people alien to our character and institutions and of undertaking a system of colonial government over this territory and these peoples without their consent—and apparently in opposition to their will—is not merely a serious innovation upon the original plan embodied by the Constitution of the United States, and contemplated by the authors of that Constitution, but that it is repugnant to the prudent counsels delivered by the wisest of our older statesmen, to say nothing about the teaching of history.

After a brief review of the past one hundred years, he accepts the republican doctrine of Providence and says:

God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. He made the Spanish war. He was not less behind Dewey in Manila than He was behind Shafter and Sampson and Schley at Santiago. What was His all-wise purpose? We know not. But there we were and there we are; and nothing is surer in the future than that we shall be there a century hence unless some power turns up strong enough to drive us out. Instead, therefore, of discussing the abstraction of imperialism, illustrated by the rights and wrongs of the Philippines, Mr. Bryan were more profitably engaged in considering how we may best administer possessions, which, for good or for evil, are with us to stay.

It will be noticed that he adopts the republican theory that God is responsible for what we have done; that it is a matter of destiny, and that we are being swept along by influences over which we have no control.

The doctrine enunciated by the republicans